

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

BAIMADAJIE ANGWANG,

Defendant.

* * * * *

Case No. 20-CR-442 (EK)

Brooklyn, New York

August 15, 2022

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR TELEPHONE CONFERENCE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ERIC R. KOMITEE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government:

MATTHEW HAGGANS, ESQ.
FRANCISCO NAVARRO, ESQ.
MEREDITH ARFA, ESQ.
SCOTT CLAFFEE, ESQ.
Asst. United States Attorney
United States Attorney's Office
271 Cadman Plaza
Brooklyn, NY 11201

For the Defendant:

JOHN F. CARMAN, ESQ.
John Carman, Esq.
666 Old Country Road
Garden City, NY 11530

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording,
transcript produced by transcription service.

Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc.
4 Research Drive, Suite 402
Shelton, Connecticut 06484 (203)929-9992

1 (Proceedings commenced)

2 THE CLERK: This is criminal cause for a telephone
3 conference, Docket No. 20-CR-442, USA v. Baimadajie Angwang.

4 Before asking the parties to state their
5 appearance, I would like to note the following. Persons
6 granted remote access to proceedings are reminded against the
7 general prohibition against photographing, recording, and
8 rebroadcasting the court proceedings.

9 Violation of these prohibitions may result in
10 sanctions, including removal of court issued media
11 credentials, restricted entry to future hearings, denial of
12 entry to future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed
13 necessary by the Court.

14 Would the parties please state their appearance,
15 government first.

16 MR. HAGGANS: Good afternoon. For the United
17 States it's Matthew Haggans, Francisco Navarro, Meredith
18 Arfa, and Scott Calffee appearing by telephone.

19 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

20 MR. CARMAN: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Your
21 Honor, it's John Carman with the defendant, Angwang.

22 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Carman,
23 to you as well.

24 And (indiscernible), I apologize for referring to
25 you as Aaron. My law clerk was going to be calling the case,

1 but we are happy and grateful to have you with us.

2 THE CLERK: You're welcome.

3 THE COURT: I called this case, obviously on very
4 short notice for conference today because in putting together
5 the unclassified CIPA Section 4 opinion that we issued on
6 Friday, we mapped out essentially what we think the schedule
7 would have to look like from here to trial in order for the
8 currently scheduled trial date, which is September 12th, for
9 jury selection to hold.

10 And as you can see from the final paragraphs in
11 that order, it's a highly accelerated time table. And I
12 don't know, and I'm not sure whether the parties yet are even
13 in a position to know how much additional related process we
14 will need between now and jury selection.

15 But the statute provides for substantial additional
16 process in the event that the defense wants to use some or
17 all of the substituted material that is in the process of
18 being turned over to them now, pursuant until the order that
19 I just issued.

20 And, you know, the bottom line at this stage is
21 that if either party believes, or comes to believe that the
22 schedule is not realistic, either party (indiscernible) the
23 defense, (indiscernible) the fact that the defense will have
24 had this evidence for substantially less time than the
25 government has, it seems to me to be in everybody's interest

1 to surface that view as quickly as possible.

2 It will help me manage my calendar where we've got
3 a bunch of, in some cases, overlapping in September, but more
4 importantly will give visibility to the parties with respect
5 to the time line on which they're working to prepare for
6 trial.

7 So with that why don't I just ask the government in
8 the first instance, to just give an update on what you see as
9 the schedule from here in terms of turning over the material
10 that we've had (indiscernible) in the orders, and then I can
11 turn the floor over to the defense to talk about whether the
12 current schedule seems realistic to them now, seems
13 unrealistic as of now, or whether it's simply not yet
14 possible for the defense to know that.

15 So, Mr. Carman, why don't we start with you, or
16 your side?

17 MR. CARMAN: Your Honor, I think that in the letter
18 that was submitted by the government --

19 THE COURT: Oh, sorry.

20 MR. CARMAN: I'm sorry?

21 THE COURT: Yeah. I meant to say Mr. Claffee.

22 MR. CARMAN: Oh, I thought you said -- okay, never
23 mind.

24 THE COURT: I did say Carman, but I meant -- I
25 meant to just ask the government first.

1 MR. CARMAN: Certainly, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Because (indiscernible) some -- some
3 additional information from the government's side about when
4 the CISO officer is available to make some of these
5 productions and related items.

6 MR. HAGGANS: Yes, I -- this is Matthew Haggans
7 speaking for the government, Your Honor, and I can give the
8 Court an update.

9 And I'll just note, Mr. Carman, I believe is aware
10 of everything I'm about to say.

11 So we've filed two update letters. The second one
12 was on Friday night and PACER was down, so we didn't docket
13 it until this morning.

14 But I'll cut to the last paragraph, which is, we've
15 arranged for the CISO to collect the material first thing
16 Wednesday morning. It's my understanding he has scheduled a
17 time with Mr. Carman, also Wednesday morning, so that he can
18 make the material available to counsel.

19 It's also my understanding that the CISO has
20 completed all of the shall we say necessary steps so that Mr.
21 Carman can actually have them without too much further delay
22 once the two of them are able to meet.

23 So from the Government's perspective, that aspect
24 of the Court's directive from its order in the CIPA 4 will be
25 completed on Wednesday.

1 From that point forward, if the defense chooses to
2 make use of the CIPA 5 process, you know, the government
3 doesn't have a prediction, of course, at this time, as to
4 whether the defense is going to pursue that.

5 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, Mr. Carman,
6 you're on mute at this point.

7 MR. CARMAN: Yeah, I was -- I was on mute, but you
8 were -- you were breaking up. I really didn't hear what you
9 said, so I'm sure you're looking for my position on this.

10 THE COURT: Yeah, on your position with respect to
11 the schedule and whether you think the trial date is likely
12 to hold at this point, unlikely to hold, whether you think it
13 makes sense to keep the pre-trial conference we have on the
14 calendar Friday on the calendar, or to move it and any other
15 observation you may (indiscernible).

16 MR. CARMAN: Your Honor, I'm in substantially the
17 same position I've been in throughout the entire process. I
18 think that that status is about to change on Wednesday, but
19 until I have an opportunity to meet with the CISO and to
20 review the material, I don't feel like I'm in a position to
21 make any prediction, you know, as to the trial schedule,
22 whether you know, my review will necessitate a delay, whether
23 it's short or long. I just -- I don't think I'll know until
24 Wednesday.

25 So it makes sense to me to keep the conference on

1 Friday, or even have another one on Thursday if you want.

2 You know, I should have a better sense of whether I need
3 some additional time, or whether I don't, having had a chance
4 to review it, but you know I'm -- I just -- I don't have any
5 sense of what I'm about to see.

6 THE COURT: Right. So I think I can say, without
7 risking any classification issues, that the material that's
8 coming your way is not tremendously voluminous, I don't
9 think.

10 And so, I don't expect it will take you a ton of
11 time to review and digest it, but I also don't think I'm
12 revealing anything beyond the scope of my unclassified
13 (indiscernible) say that, you know, if there are substituted
14 materials coming your way, it's the case under the statute.

15 Those are coming your way because there were
16 indications that the material was helpful -- material were
17 helpful to the defense, and so I would expect -- and you
18 know, the government will just stop me if I'm getting ahead
19 of myself here, but I would expect that, you know, material
20 that is helpful to the defense, material almost by definition
21 that the defense will want to use, and if that will require
22 additional CIPA 5 -- the CIPA Section 5 process then, you
23 know, maybe the government has a view at this point on
24 whether (indiscernible) assuming there's a CIPA Section 5
25 process to come, whether that's realistic on the current time

1 table or not realistic.

2 MR. HAGGANS: Your Honor, it's Matthew Haggans
3 again.

4 It's difficult for the government to sort of
5 evaluate the defense's view. And I think we would have to do
6 that in order to come to some informed view as to whether the
7 current schedule is achievable.

8 You know, off the cuff, I believe I tend to agree
9 with Mr. Carman that we have a -- we have a conference on the
10 blocks already for this coming Friday, and certainly by then
11 the defense will have had the opportunity to evaluate the
12 material and I expect come to at least a preliminary view, if
13 not a considered view, of what, if anything, they intend to
14 do.

15 I would just note, at that -- at that conference,
16 it's currently scheduled as a, you know, a regular in-person
17 court proceeding without any, you know, classified component.
18 Not necessarily that we would need it to address the
19 schedule, but I'm just noting that for the record.

20 THE COURT: Yeah. But answer the hypothetical for
21 me if you can, Mr. Haggans. If you assume that the response
22 from the defense is either of the following, either having
23 seen the material that's in the process of being delivered to
24 them, yet it is the defense's intention to use some of that
25 material at trial, or even a more modified version of that

1 response along the lines of we can't, as the defense, rule
2 out now the likelihood that we will want to use this material
3 at trial, especially given the difficulties that defense
4 counsel will have in the meantime at least, conversing with
5 his own client about this stuff.

6 If those are the responses, or one or both of those
7 are the responses, what happens next from the government's
8 perspective and on what rough time table would the government
9 anticipate that happening?

10 MR. HAGGANS: So in either scenario, Your Honor,
11 the defense counsel would be preparing whatever it is they
12 might be seeking to file.

13 It's our understanding that they would need to do
14 that with the assistance of the CISO in the -- you know, the
15 appropriate space within the courthouse. Obviously, he could
16 not be preparing it from home, or you know, on his laptop or
17 anything like that, without -- without knowing --

18 THE COURT: Why? Why (indiscernible) prepare a
19 one-sentence letter that says, we can use everything that's
20 just been turned over to us, full stop? That letter would
21 not be classified.

22 MR. HAGGANS: I agree, Your Honor. A cover letter
23 providing notice of the motion would not be classified, but
24 in my limited experience at the CIPA 5 and CIPA 6 stages,
25 they will typically try to articulate what it is that they're

1 -- what it is is their theory, and I think in this scenario,
2 that would need to happen in the -- in the classified
3 setting.

4 THE COURT: Why -- just elucidate the reason for
5 that a little bit. Like, why (indiscernible) say something
6 about their theory?

7 I mean, you -- you know, as appears in the
8 unclassified order, the only reason we're getting to get
9 where we're at now is because, you know, there's been some
10 realization that at least some of the material that we had to
11 run through the CIPA Section 4 process is helpful and
12 material.

13 And so, if everybody agrees with it, why do they
14 need -- like, what is the CIPA 5 -- Section 5 motion in this
15 case look like, as best you can anticipate?

16 MR. HAGGANS: It requires a particularized
17 statement that sets out with specificity the classified
18 information that counsel reasonably believes is necessary,
19 and --

20 THE COURT: All right.

21 MR. HAGGANS: -- under the text of the statute,
22 Section 5A, that notice shall include a brief description of
23 the classified information.

24 I can't envision in the -- in any case in general,
25 and certainly in the circumstance of this case in particular,

1 Your Honor, how the defense could complete that submission
2 without providing a filing that is in a sealed and classified
3 setting, and I would note in the cases in which I -- that I
4 have litigated that have involved filings under Section 5,
5 they occur in the sealed and classified setting as a matter
6 of course.

7 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

8 So that's helpful, and I guess for purposes of this
9 conversation, we should all be assuming that the defense will
10 need to prepare a CIPA Section 5 motion, and that that will
11 be somewhat logistically complex in that Mr. Carman will need
12 to be working with the classified information security
13 officer to, you know, have access to a secure laptop, or
14 whatever it's going to be in the courthouse, so that he can
15 work with classified material accordingly.

16 But assume that that's going to happen, and assume
17 that in substance, the classified file you get says we want
18 to use either a lot of or all of the material that we
19 received through the Section 4, what happens next?

20 MR. HAGGANS: We would then -- this is the
21 government, Your Honor -- would then be preparing our
22 opposition, or response under Section 6 in which we'd be -- I
23 don't want to predict the future, because I don't know what
24 the defense might be articulating, but we would then be
25 seeking a hearing to address that information.

1 THE COURT: Okay. And the remedy, or other relief
2 that you're seeking at that hearing consists of what? An
3 application to preclude the defense from using that
4 information? An application to seal the courtroom?

5 MR. HAGGANS: I will (indiscernible).

6 THE COURT: What can you tell me at this stage?

7 MR. HAGGANS: So with -- I would prefer not to get
8 into specifics in that that might communicate something about
9 the underlying information, Your Honor, but the Court is
10 correct.

11 One possible request the government could make
12 would be to essentially deny the defendant the authorization
13 to use that material.

14 THE COURT: Okay. But all this -- so today is
15 August 15th, and jury selection is set for September 12th,
16 and I could be missing something.

17 I could be missing something glaring when I tell
18 you what my working assumptions are as to where we stand now,
19 but it just seems to me logical to say that if there's
20 material -- if, you know, documents or other evidence as to
21 which the Court and the government are agreed, you know, that
22 needs to be regarded for (indiscernible) the defense, then
23 almost by definition, one would expect the defense to say,
24 look, we (indiscernible) use this material.

25 And so, whatever happens next in this

1 (indiscernible) process, I question (indiscernible) happen
2 realistically.

3 Is there any scenario from the government's
4 perspective in which the process that (indiscernible) can do
5 so, can be worked through effectively on the current time
6 line? Again, we assume that the defense is going to say
7 something other than, oh no, I don't need any of it.

8 MR. HAGGANS: The government believes the answer is
9 yes, it remains possible, Your Honor, insofar as -- and in
10 particular because the Court is already familiar with the
11 material.

12 This is not a case in which, for example, the -- as
13 happens in some cases, the defendant is a clear defense
14 contractor and is charged with sharing information
15 unauthorized and the defendant is seeking to use information
16 in their own head.

17 THE COURT: Right.

18 MR. HAGGANS: This is not that type of case. The
19 Court is already familiar with the information, and so we
20 don't have that necessity for a spin up on a new topic from
21 the Court's perspective.

22 THE COURT: Right. Okay. But -- yeah, there are
23 two -- there's two -- two big unknowns at this point, which
24 are one, what's the defense response going to be when they
25 (indiscernible) the material in question. I think we can

1 guess with a high degree of confidence what that will be,
2 which is yes, we'd like to use at least some of this stuff,
3 or at least we can't rule out the possibility.

4 I think the bigger unknown at this point is, what
5 will the government's response to that indication be, and so
6 -- so the government makes a very good point that the answer
7 to that question can't really be provided this week with the
8 hearing scheduled the way it is. Right? Because -- because
9 we're going to be in open court on Friday, and so what?

10 Like, is there -- Thursday afternoon would be
11 better for me for a variety of reasons than Friday morning,
12 and I guess one question is -- and I'm glad we have Mr.
13 Rucker on the phone for this question, but I put it to the
14 government lawyers in the first instance.

15 Would it be possible to convert Friday's pre-trial
16 conference, which seems premature to me, into a discussion of
17 these Section 5 issues, and to do that in a secure and sealed
18 setting with both parties present, government and defense?

19 Mr. (indiscernible).

20 MR. HAGGANS: Yeah, this is Matt Haggans speaking.

21 THE COURT: Sound workable to you?

22 MR. HAGGANS: This is Matt Haggans speaking, Your
23 Honor. Subject to the CISO schedule and the Court's
24 schedule, government will of course make itself available for
25 such a conference.

1 I just note I -- the Court said the parties. I
2 think it would be counsel, but based on the Court's existing
3 order --

4 THE COURT: Yes. Yes.

5 MR. HAGGANS: -- the defendant would not be
6 present.

7 THE COURT: Correct. Thank you for the
8 clarification. When I -- yeah, I spoke generally that way.
9 I just meant to say that both sides would be represented, but
10 I agree. Then if we're going to be discussing classified
11 material. that the status quo right now would indicate that
12 lawyers and cleared court reporter only, and not the
13 defendant himself.

14 Mr. Carman, what do you think about that proposal?
15 You had (indiscernible) on Thursday in your earlier remarks.

16 MR. CARMAN: I'm available Thursday afternoon, Your
17 Honor.

18 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So let's -- let's do
19 that, then.

20 Let's plan to gather at, I'm going to say 3:00 this
21 Thursday, August 18th for the purposes we have talked about
22 here and, you know, if the government can go through that,
23 that mental exercise that I've kind of posited here today,
24 which is assume the defense comes back and says we intends to
25 put some or all of this material into evidence, or at least

1 we can't rule out that possibility, then we'll hear from the
2 government on the subject of where we go from there in their
3 view.

4 MR. HAGGANS: Understood, Your Honor, and in that
5 type of setting it will be a little easier for the government
6 to respond with particularity than it is on this platform.
7 Thank you.

8 THE COURT: Yeah. Totally understand. I
9 appreciate the (indiscernible) associated with having this
10 kind of conversation in this setting and the limits there.
11 At least we've -- I think we've set ourselves up to have that
12 conversation on Thursday in a, you know, in a more productive
13 manner than we can right now.

14 Okay. Anything else, starting with the defense?
15 Anything else that we should be talking about today while
16 we're all together?

17 MR. CARMAN: So, Your Honor, would you be expecting
18 my CIPA 5 notice of intent to use the CIPA Section 5 material
19 on Wednesday?

20 I think I can probably do that with the CISO, but
21 not, you know, not 100 percent sure, but it sounds like I can
22 -- I can probably put something together while I'm over
23 there, you know, a very basic submission, just giving
24 evidence of the defense's intent to use the material.
25 Obviously not going to be an elaborate motion of any kind.

1 THE COURT: Yeah, that sounds right to me.

2 I think Mr. Haggans put his finger on the key
3 distinction between the -- either the Section 5 process in
4 this case and some other hypothetical cases. It's not like,
5 we don't think, although you'll correct us on Thursday if
6 we're wrong, it's not like we're going to be hearing about
7 new evidence for the first time that nobody's seen on the
8 Government's side, and so, you know, maybe that makes your
9 (indiscernible) a little bit easier.

10 But at a minimum, Mr. Carman, if you would just be
11 in a position to tell us what your intent is, even if the
12 (indiscernible) you're ultimately (indiscernible) has not
13 been understandably completed by that point, that will I
14 think help us map out next steps.

15 And again, the government should anticipate, you
16 know -- think expansively about what the defense may be
17 asking for and speculate a potential response accordingly.

18 All right. Mr. Haggans, anything else from
19 government's side?

20 MR. HAGGANS: Two -- just two matters, Your Honor.
21 One, I take it for now, the conference previously set for
22 Friday remains set on Friday?

23 THE COURT: You know, I -- when I schedule pre-
24 trial conferences I'm, you know, usually anticipating that
25 we'll be, you know, definitively resolving or maybe having

1 oral argument on -- or both, motions in limine, you know,
2 resolving other issues about the manner in which the trial,
3 logistically speaking, will actually unfold, and I think
4 that's probably premature at this point.

5 And so my inclination would be to do the Thursday
6 conference in lieu of, rather than in addition to Friday pre-
7 trial conference. But if, Mr. Haggans, you or Mr. Carman
8 think otherwise, I would be interested to hear why.

9 MR. HAGGANS: I suppose, Your Honor, following the
10 sort of bird in the hand being worth two in the bush
11 principle, considering we're going to see each other on
12 Thursday and have a more robust and collective view as to the
13 path forward, the government's recommendation would be to
14 keep the Friday appearance on the calendar, as it would be
15 very difficult to put it back on once everybody's time is
16 released.

17 THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. That's fine with me.

18 MR. HAGGANS: And if the Court has a different view
19 after Thursday's proceedings, then we can address it then.

20 THE COURT: Exactly.

21 THE COURT: I think --

22 MR. CARMAN: The only --

23 THE COURT: -- if Thursday is productive, it's
24 unlikely that we would also do Friday, but -- yeah, Mr.
25 Carman?

1 MR. CARMAN: I was just going to throw into the
2 mix, Your Honor, we're considering whether to respond to the
3 government's motions in limine, and I think your rules give
4 me until Monday the 22nd to file in writing. I don't think a
5 scheduling order superceded that, so I don't --

6 THE COURT: Right. No, I agree with that.

7 MR. CARMAN: -- I don't (indiscernible) being able
8 to deal with that by the 19th.

9 THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, look let's, as Mr.
10 Haggans says, like anything could happen between now and
11 Thursday, inclusive.

12 I suppose it's possible that the matters we're
13 talking about on Thursday are so convoluted and complicated
14 that we just need Friday for a continuation of Thursday's
15 proceeding, and so I don't see much downside in just keeping
16 that on the calendar now, just to, you know, try to preserve
17 everybody's availability.

18 But I do think the overwhelming likelihood is that
19 on Thursday we'll release that Friday time slot. But yeah,
20 for the moment, let's keep everything on the calendar.

21 MR. HAGGANS: Understood, Your Honor. It's Matt
22 Haggans again.

23 The other item as part of the Court's order last
24 Thursday evening, the Court directed the government to review
25 both its ex parte filings and the forthcoming -- to us, via

1 the CISO, copy of the Court's classified memorandum
2 accompanying its order for what I would refer to as a
3 declassification review.

4 The government would request a briefing calendar so
5 that we can move the Court to reconsider those aspects of its
6 order under the text of the CIPA Section 4 statute.

7 THE COURT: All right. Say what sections you're
8 asking for reconsideration on.

9 MR. HAGGANS: Towards the end of the Court's order,
10 Your Honor, the Court directed the government to review its -
11 - the Government's ex parte filings in this matter to
12 generate redacted portions.

13 THE COURT: At?

14 MR. HAGGANS: This is at Pages 13 and 14.

15 THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah.

16 Well, I saw -- I did see in a bunch of Eastern
17 District, specifically opinions on similar subject matter the
18 judges said, look, I'm not going to direct that a redacted
19 version be filed, because that version would be redacted so
20 thoroughly that nothing useful would appear at the basis for
21 reconsideration. They'd look to -- there would just be
22 nothing left.

23 MR. HAGGANS: In sum and substance, that's correct,
24 Your Honor, but we -- but we are --

25 THE COURT: Yeah. I (indiscernible) --

1 MR. HAGGANS: -- happy to brief the issue.

2 THE COURT: Now, and I mean -- yes, you can -- you
3 can submit a fairly short letter brief. I think the
4 reasoning does suggest itself at some level.

5 You know, my interest is just in -- in making this
6 public and see as much of what's happening here as the
7 statute and (indiscernible) security imperatives therein
8 allow, and you know -- and so at a minimum, the docket
9 should reflect at least that there was a filing on a given
10 date, maybe on a given subject.

11 But, you know, just think about -- think about
12 that from my perspective. That like if the issue we're
13 solving for is, you know, what is the most that we can tell
14 the public or make apparent to the public about what
15 happened on a given date, even if it's just you know, one
16 sentence at an utterly high level generality, you know, that
17 will help.

18 I understand that it could be a very time
19 consuming and ultimately futile exercise for the government
20 to go through these briefs and redact everything that CIPA
21 would require.

22 MR. HAGGANS: So, Your Honor, I would just note
23 for the Court's attention, it is our practice in any case
24 involving CIPA filings, and it's the practice we've followed
25 in this case, that we do docket a public notice that --

1 THE COURT: Right.

2 MR. HAGGANS: -- something under the statute has
3 been filed, we typically do that by filing a very brief
4 letter for purposes of the record and attaching what is
5 sometimes referred to as the half sheet or the cover sheet,
6 which is the top page of whatever substantive filing is
7 provided, stripped of any real classification markings or
8 otherwise sensitive information.

9 We have done that in this case, and I think Your
10 Honor is -- has accurately devined that the sum and
11 substance of our motion for reconsideration as it were,
12 would be that we are at the perimeter of what CIPA requires
13 us to ensure is placed on the public record.

14 THE COURT: Yeah. But I'm framing the question a
15 little bit differently, which is not what is the limit of
16 what CIPA requires, but also what is the limit of what you
17 can do.

18 You know, I mean, I have to go back and look at
19 each of these cover letters individually, but I'm asking a
20 question about whether they say as much as they can say, not
21 as much as CIPA requires, but as much as they can say
22 without implicating national security concerns or otherwise
23 contravening any CIPA imperatives such that, you know, a
24 court watcher could say, okay, I understand at least like
25 what stage the case was at when that filing got made, and I

1 understand, you know, generally speaking what kind of filing
2 this is, even if I don't know anything about the specifics
3 being argued.

4 But you know, you can put in a short letter on
5 this. I think you understand where I'm coming from, and I
6 have suggested that I am (indiscernible) where it is you're
7 coming from, and we can take that -- we can take those next
8 steps at that time.

9 MR. HAGGANS: Understood, Your Honor. Does the
10 Court want to give us a date for that filing? The order is
11 -- has --

12 THE COURT: Sorry, go ahead.

13 MR. HAGGANS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I was just
14 noting the order directs us to complete those steps, I
15 believe within 14 days.

16 THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, that's -- how about
17 Monday for the consideration letter?

18 MR. HAGGANS: Understood. Thank you, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Carman,
20 anything else from the defense side?

21 MR. CARMAN: No, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, everybody. We
23 will reconvene on Thursday afternoon.

24 MR. HAGGANS: Thank you, Your Honor. Have a good
25 afternoon.

1 THE COURT: And with that, we're adjourned.

2 MR. CARMAN: Thank you.

3 (Proceedings concluded)

4 I, CHRISTINE FIORE, court-approved transcriber and
5 certified electronic reporter and transcriber, certify that
6 the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official
7 electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-
8 entitled matter.

9

10 

11 _____ August 16, 2022

12 Christine Fiore, CERT

13 Transcriber

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25